

WASHINGTON.

Williams Explains the Uses Made of the Secret Service Money.

"A LEGITIMATE EXPENDITURE."

Democratic Discussion of the Presidential Prospect.

OHIO IN OCTOBER.

Mr. Bristow Answered Reprovingly by Mr. Caulfield.

FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT

WASHINGTON, April 20, 1876.

JAVELIN DISCUSSION ON THE INDIAN SERVICE BILL—THE INDIAN RING IN ABBEY.

The House became very lively to-day over the bill transferring the Indian service to the War Department. The contention is very bitter, and the whole Indian Ring has arrayed its forces in desperate opposition to the bill. The agents and tools of this Ring are very busy to-night, and by a singular fatality a good many ill-informed clergymen and other persons of perfectly upright motives are helping the Ring by urging that the army will not civilize the Indians, and that the change would be prejudicial to the interests of missionary workers among the savages. They forget that the order, cleanliness and discipline which an army officer would introduce on a reservation, if he were made Indian agent, would be an immense help to the missionary, that the permanence in office of an army officer is a guaranty of his good conduct, which the present system does not provide, and that missionary and Christianizing efforts can best be carried on by men who have no business relations to the Indians, but are independent and supported by voluntary contributions of the churches. There is, in spite of all opposition, to-night a fair prospect that the bill will pass by a handsome majority. It will have, according to the prospects at the hour of adjournment, almost the whole democratic vote and a considerable support from the republican side. It becomes a law it will save at least \$100,000 to the government.

RELATIONS OF OHIO WITH THE PRESIDENTIAL QUESTION.

There has also been some talk to-day about the relation of Ohio to the Presidential contest. Those democrats who wish an Eastern candidate urge that if Mr. Thurman received the nomination, and if then Ohio should go republican in October, this would seal the fate of the democratic party in November, whereas if a candidate from another State were nominated the loss of Ohio would not be nearly so serious or demoralizing.

JUDGE DAVID DAVIS' MERITS AND DEMERITS AS AN "AVAILABLE" PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE—DISCUSSION AMONG THE DEMOCRATS.

There has been for some time a growing feeling here among democrats that, while Judge David Davis is not a democrat, he is on several accounts a very available man for the democratic nomination at St. Louis. Those who think thus say that Judge Davis is very strong in the West, that he would conciliate the confidence of a large number of voters who are tired of the republicans, but who do not like to support a democrat; that he has long and friendly relations with Western labor associations, which would secure him their zealous support; that he would be unobjectionable to the South; that his position on the currency question is not sufficiently pronounced to make him disliked by anybody; that he is a man of unbounded purity and uprightness of character, whose nomination would inspire confidence and respect among the people, and that his relations to candidacy before the Cincinnati Convention of 1872, which nominated Mr. Greeley, would make him acceptable to the liberal republicans who were at that movement. For all these reasons, they say Judge Davis would make a very strong democratic candidate.

There are, however, democrats who do not think that Judge Davis' qualities are so promising. These say that in the first place the democratic party ought to nominate a democrat; that, moreover, his affiliations with the labor reform party would weaken him all over the country, because the platform of that party in 1872, on which he was nominated and which he never formally repudiated, demanded unlimited greenbacks, the taxation of the national debt, made them legal tender for all debts, public and private; the passage of an eight-hour law, government regulation of railroads and telegraphs and Mr. Kelley's famous introvertible 3.5 bond. On this platform Judge Davis was nominated February 22, and, after thanking the Convention for the nomination, he held it under advisement until after the meeting of the Cincinnati Convention, and finally replied to the labor reformers, on June 14, that, having "consented to the use of his name in Cincinnati, and that Convention having nominated Mr. Greeley," he thought it "proper to retire absolutely from the Presidential contest." It is argued now that this showing that Judge Davis must be supposed to sympathize with the extreme inflationists and with the very crude ideas of the labor reformers, so called, in the West, and it is said that a candidate with such sympathies and opinions would be sure to defeat his party. Moreover, the same persons say that the country will not see with pleasure a judge of the Supreme Court becoming a candidate for a political office, and that this would set a great many conservative voters against him. In short, these democrats assert that Judge Davis, instead of being a strong "available" candidate, would in reality greatly weaken the party, in spite of some strong points which are admitted.

FROM OUR REGULAR CORRESPONDENT.

WASHINGTON, April 20, 1876.

THE EX-ATTORNEY GENERAL'S EXPLANATION OF THE EXPENDITURES FROM THE SECRET SERVICE FUND—DAVENPORT'S REGISTRATION SYSTEM.

Ex-Archbishop General Williams having been spoken to this evening in regard to the expenditures in the Department of Justice through the Secret Service Bureau, stated that the first he knew of the requirements of Davenport was one day when he went over to see the President, who had just returned from New York, where he had seen Davenport, who came to him to lay before him his comprehensive system of registration, which he had been four years in completing. The President was in raptures over it, and said it would be a good thing if it could be adopted all over the United States, as it was certain to insure honest elections and guarantee protection to citizens in exercising the right of suffrage. Ex-Archbishop General Williams said that he declined to pay the amounts which Mr. Davenport continued to require, though at first he paid out \$2,000, but it was not from a want of appreciation of the good work which he recognized Davenport to be doing. He objected to disturbing money through this channel, as he wanted to reserve everything for the expense of the judiciary which he was bound to provide for under the appropriations. He had been called on, however, to expend nearly \$500,000 in the matter of adding to preserve peace at elections and in the suppression of the Ku Klux, which he did not consider as improperly expending money to influence elections one way or another, because, to his knowledge, no discrimination had been made in favor of either of the contending political parties, but simply he had aimed to see that as a matter of justice and a proper connection with the courts and judicial supervision fair elections should be secured to the people. One thing, however, he did not like much at the time was the expenditure on the registration of Davenport for \$50,000, prior to the election of 1872, because he apprehended that some day the cry would be made that the money was paid for party purposes, and an interference with the election, and Mr. Davenport, however, had completed immense work, having so arranged his registration and appointment of supervisors who acted under him as the chief, that months before the election he had accurately recorded the residence, number and full particulars of every voter, so that when election

day came he did not have to hurry and bustle about with a lot of subordinate supervisors. The President, however, had spoken to Mr. Williams and written to him to honor the requirements of Mr. Davenport, as he perfectly understood and appreciated the work which he had done. He had not examined the system of Davenport's registration until after he had gone out of office, and he thought that the money had been neither improperly nor injudiciously expended. He did not feel that the President had done anything wrong. When it was explained that it was for registration and under limitations provided for in the appropriation and covered by them the thing had no other different look from that of expenditure for party purposes. The inference was suggested that it was this money which should be expended by the courts and in the securing of elections properly conducted.

DAVENPORT'S EXPECTED TESTIMONY—EFFECT OF THE EXPOSURE.

John Davenport, who disbursed the money paid by Whitley on President Grant's order before the elections in New York, is expected in Washington in the morning. He has telegraphed the Chairman of the committee to that effect, and says in addition that he will show that besides the \$400,000 spent on government account he paid \$25,000 out of his own pocket. The committee took no new testimony on the subject to-day, but went into executive session on a proposition to send the present testimony to the President with a letter asking his response to such parts of it as related to himself; but the proposition was dropped in consequence of a suggestion that it would be better to wait until all the expected testimony on the subject was in. Colonel Whitley was in attendance at the committee room, but was not further examined.

The Herald's revelation of the matter to-day caused a good deal of excitement, especially among the republicans, to whom it was a startling and unpleasant piece of news. It was generally acknowledged that any positive and respectable proof of the corruption and use of public funds in the elections would be more damaging to the party than even the Belknap scandal, because the people would very bitterly resent it. There is no talk among the democrats of an impeachment movement, even if they should get evidence abundantly warranting it. It may be taken for granted that they comprehend that impeachment of a President is a political blunder, and the shrewder democrats say that such exposure as the Orville Grant business, the Babcock business and the present matter are more damaging to their opponents than any impeachment could be. In fact, the democrats care but little whether Belknap is convicted or not, except so far as justice imposes upon them the duty of prosecuting him. They are quite willing that the republican Senate shall, if it likes, take the odium of convicting him.

It is said that Davenport, in explanation of the receipts to Whitley for the \$400,000 received from the Secret Service fund, will swear before the committee that he did not use it for election purposes, but strictly for Secret Service matters. In this connection it is also said that Davenport has never been connected with the Secret Service branch of the government and knows nothing about the detective business.

THE SALE OF THE GENEVA AWARD BONDS.

The Secretary of the Treasury had a conference to-day with the Ways and Means Committee on the subject of Mr. Davenport's resolution directing the sale in currency of the Geneva Award bonds in sums of \$1,000 and multiples thereof. Mr. Davenport assured the committee that the method of selling bonds practised for so many years had been proven by long experience to be the best one, and he thought, therefore, that the committee ought to allow the Treasury to follow the longest established plan, such as was proposed in the advertisement already issued for the disposal of the installment of bonds under consideration.

MRS. AVERY CONFESSES GRAVE FACTS REGARDING THE PRESIDENT AND BABCOCK TO ATTORNEY GENERAL PIERPONT.

Mrs. W. O. Avery, wife of the Treasury clerk just sentenced to the penitentiary for complicity in the St. Louis whiskey frauds, returned to Washington recently, and it is said to-night on good authority that she went before Attorney General Pierpont to-day and confessed all that she knew in regard to the whiskey frauds so far as they affected President and implicate Babcock and her husband. The interview was lengthy and of a most serious and painful character.

GENERAL WASHINGTON DESPATCHES.

WASHINGTON, April 20, 1876.

DENIAL OF THE CHARGE AGAINST SECRETARY BRISTOW.

The following card is published this morning:—
TO THE PUBLIC:—
There has been mentioned in connection with an alleged plan to nominate Secretary of the Treasury, of \$400,000 as an inducement to him to resign his position as United States District Attorney for the Southern District of New York, and to accept of a seat on the Supreme Court, a charge that I have not lived in Kentucky since 1861; that I have not owned or had anything to do with distilleries in that State since anywhere about the last two years; that I never paid Mr. Bristow, either directly or indirectly, one cent in all my life for any purpose whatever, and that no one has for me; that he has never been my attorney in any matter whatever, and I am entirely at a loss to account for the origin of the base and baseless slander which connects my name with the whiskey frauds. I am, however, a citizen of Kentucky, and I am, in fact, this denial I most emphatically repeat to-day and challenge all proof to the contrary.

RESPONSE OF MR. CAULFIELD'S COMMITTEE TO SECRETARY BRISTOW'S LETTER.

Representative Caulfield, Chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, has addressed the following letter to Secretary Bristow:—

HONORABLE REPRESENTATIVE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 20, 1876.
DEAR SIR:—Yours of yesterday, the 19th inst., was received at our committee room nearly simultaneously with the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, and in reply I am directed by the committee to say that the article you enclose from the Baltimore *Gazette*, as far as it relates to the previous history of the committee, is entirely without the knowledge or authority of the committee. In reference to your criticism upon what you are pleased to term "my errors of judgment," we must regret that our committee claims the right to conduct the business with which it is intrusted as it believes the best interest of the public to be best served by the exercise of its discretion in the rights of every individual, and this committee will believe that your criticism of its action was rather the result of a misunderstanding of its position, and of any just ground of censure of it. The testimony of Judge Bartley made no charge against you, but was simply hearsay as to what he claimed had been said by Mr. Bristow. It is contained nothing upon which a cross-examination by you seemed to be demanded.

It was, however, agreed that one of the committee should communicate to you what had happened. A gentleman of the committee accordingly called on you the next morning (Tuesday), and apprised you of the foregoing circumstances. You informed him that you had already heard that these two witnesses had been called by the committee, and that you had seen the subsequent publication of the article you enclose from the Baltimore *Gazette* as hardly warranting you in saying that he had been so grossly misrepresented by the public prints, even at the risk of appearing to reflect upon the methods of your committee. As to the further investigation of the matter, the committee will be willing to accord it to you if you still desire it, but we consider it wholly unnecessary, as there are no charges made or proven against you, and you stand before us with the fullest exonerations of every suspicion.

I remain, Very respectfully, Sir,

B. G. CAULFIELD.

Chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

Hon. B. H. Bristow, Secretary of the Treasury.

JUDGE BARTLEY EXPLAINS.

The following letter has been addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice by Judge Bartley:—

WASHINGTON, April 20, 1876.

Sir:—Secretary Bristow's letter of the 19th inst., to-day, implicitly represents me as having voluntarily appeared before your committee and detailed rumors and charges against me. It is, in fact, a "trap" to require whether Mr. Bristow had not been informed prior to the date of his letter by at least one member of the committee that the committee was required by legal process and that information as to the subject upon which the committee desired to examine me, although requested by me, was refused by the committee, and that I was sworn to by Bristow represents me as having testified against him

on rumors and belief. You know that I did neither, and he complains that, although he could have been reached by information in a few minutes, he was kept in ignorance of the exact character of the charges against me, and without opportunity to meet the charges. I am permitted to inquire whether Mr. Bristow had not been in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact tenor of my testimony. You will bear witness that it was after he had stated that he had no personal knowledge of the matter that you required me to state what another person had stated to me on the subject, but that I did not venture the truth of that statement, because I feared if I stated of perversion of my testimony Mr. Bristow will show to your committee by the recorded evidence that he was not in communication with at least one of your committee touching my testimony in a short time after it took place, and whether the exact import of my testimony had been withheld from him, or was not at all true, and whether he was not, in fact, misled by a number of distilleries, and whether, in substance, that while he was United States District Attorney in Kentucky, a number of distilleries were seized at his instance, and that soon after, upon an offer of a large amount of money, he resigned and procured the appointment of his assistant as his successor, and became an agent for those distilleries. As you know, and my testimony will show, I am I deposited to no such fact on information and belief, but I make an honest assumption as to the import of my testimony, and then pronounce it unqualifiedly false. This may be ingenious, but it is neither fair nor true, and I respectfully ask to be informed whether Mr. Bristow was denied an opportunity to know the exact